

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes new FIGS. 6A and 6B. A Letter to the Official Draftsperson is also attached herewith.

Attachment: New Drawing Sheet (FIGS. 6A & 6B).
Letter to the Official Draftsperson

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In section 1 of the office action, the drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a).

In response to the objection to the drawings, the new drawings of Figures 6A and 6B are being added in accordance with 37 CFR 1.121(e) so that the disclosure is amended to secure substantial correspondence between the claims, the remainder of the specification, and the drawings. No new matter is being added by virtue of the amendment to the drawings and specification.

Various claims are being amended as shown above. The claim amendments clarify the claim language and are not intended to limit the scope of the claims, unless the claim language is expressly quoted in the following remarks to distinguish over the cited art. No new matter is added by virtue of the amendment to the claims.

In section 3 of the office action, claims 1-6, 13-18, 25-30, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Kneeland (U.S. Patent No. 5,574,815). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Kneeland is directed to a communications cable 10 (Figure 1) including an optical fiber 12, and an inner electrical conductor 16 that surrounds the optical fiber 12 and is in adhering contact (see, column 8, line 31, and Figures 1 & 2) with the optical fiber 12. Therefore, since the inner electrical conductor 16 is in adhering contact with the optical fiber 12, and since the inner electrical conductor 16 offers protection (column 9, line 64) to the

optical fiber 12, Kneeland does not disclose, does not suggest, and teaches away from a non-conductive material between the optical fiber 12 and the inner electrical conductor 16.

Independent claim 1 distinguishes over Kneeland at least by reciting *"an apparatus for supplying power over an optical link,"* including *"a hybrid cable including an optical fiber, an outer conductor, and a non-conductive material between the optical fiber and the outer conductor, wherein the optical fiber is configured to transmit an optical signal and the conductor is configured to transmit a power signal; a first fiber optic link; a first node; a first connector coupled by the first fiber optic link to the first node; a first conductor; a power source, wherein the first connector is further coupled by the first conductor to the power source; a second fiber optic link; a second node; a second connector coupled by the second fiber optic link to the second node; and a second conductor, wherein the second connector is coupled by the second conductor to the second node"*, and such features are not disclosed or suggested by Kneeland.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Kneeland.

Various independent claims are being amended to recite similar features and are each patentable over Kneeland.

Dependent claims 2-6, 14-18, 26-30 each depends from various ones of claims 1, 13, and 25, and are each patentable over Kneeland for at least the same reasons that their respective base claim is patentable over the cited reference. Furthermore, each of the claims 2-6, 14-18, 26-

30 distinguishes over Kneeland by reciting additional features.

Accordingly, claims 1-6, 13-18, 25-30 and 37 are each patentable over Kneeland.

For the above reasons, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102.

In section 4 of the office action, claims 1-4, 9-11, 13-16, 21-23, 25-28, 33-35, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Desmons (U.S. Patent No. 5,228,104). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Desmons is directed to a cable (Figure 6) with electrical conductors C1-C3 and insulating tubes (I1-I3).

Independent claim 1 distinguishes over Desmons at least by reciting various features as noted above, and such features are not disclosed or suggested by Desmons. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Desmons.

Various independent claims are being amended to recite similar features and are each patentable over Desmons.

Dependent claims 2-4, 9-11, 14-16, 21-23, 24-28, and 33-35 each depends from various ones of claims 1, 13, and 25, and are each patentable over Desmons for at least the same reasons that their respective base claim is patentable over the cited reference. Furthermore, each of the claims 2-4, 9-11, 14-16, 21-23, 24-28, and 33-35 distinguishes over Desmons by reciting additional features.

Accordingly, claims 1-4, 9-11, 13-16, 21-23, 25-28, 33-35, and 37 are each patentable over Desmons.

For the above reasons, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102.

In section 5 of the office action, claims 1-4, 10-16, 22-28, and 34-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being allegedly being anticipated by Pryor, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,479,702). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Pryor is directed to an optical fiber communication cable, including optical fibers 50 and cushioning material 52. A sheath 31 surrounds the cushioning material 52. A conductor 34 is between the sheath 31 and an insulator (dielectric layer) 70 (Figure 9) or the sheath 31 may be between the optical fibers 50 and the conductor 34 (Figure 9).

Independent claim 1 distinguishes over Pryor at least by reciting various features as noted above, and such features are not disclosed or suggested by Pryor.

Various independent claims are being amended to recite similar features and are each patentable over Pryor.

Dependent claims 2-4, 10-12, 14-16, 22-24, 26-28, and 34-36 each depends from various ones of claims 1, 13, and 25, and are each patentable over Pryor for at least the same reasons that their respective base claim is patentable over the cited reference. Furthermore, each of the claims 2-4, 10-12, 14-16, 22-24, 26-28, and 34-36 distinguishes over Pryor by reciting additional features.

Accordingly, claims 1-4, 10-16, 22-28, and 34-37 are each patentable over Pryor.

For the above reasons, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102.

In section 6 of the office action, claims 1, 7, 8, 13, 19, 20, 25, 31, 32, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Arroyo, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,745,627). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Arroyo is directed to a composite cable 10 (Figure 1) including a central conductor 14 surrounded by an insulator (dielectric) member 16 which is in turn surrounded by an outer conductor 18. A optical fibers 30 and 31 are surrounded by insulating jacket 32 and the insulating jacket is positioned next to the outer conductor 18.

Independent claim 1 distinguishes over Arroyo at least by reciting various features as noted above, and such features are not disclosed or suggested by Arroyo.

Various independent claims are being amended to recite similar features and are each patentable over Pryor.

Dependent claims 7-8, 19-20, and 31-32 each depends from various ones of claims 1, 13, and 25, and are each patentable over Arroyo for at least the same reasons that their respective base claim is patentable over the cited reference. Furthermore, each of the claims 7-8, 19-20, and 31-32 distinguishes over Arroyo by reciting additional features.

Accordingly, claims 1, 7, 8, 13, 19, 20, 25, 31, 32, and 37 are each patentable over Arroyo.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Various new claims are being added and each new claim recite features that are not disclosed and are not suggested by the cited reference, considered singly or in combination.

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all pending claims.

If the undersigned attorney has overlooked a teaching in the cited reference that is relevant to the allowability of the claims, the Examiner is respectfully requested to specifically point out where such teachings may be found.

CONTACT INFORMATION

If the Examiner has any questions or needs any additional information, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (805) 681-5078.


Date: July 7, 2005

Respectfully submitted,
Andreas H. Koertel



By: Arnold M. de Guzman
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 39,955
805.681.5078
805.681.5076 (FAX)

Please send correspondence to:
IP Administration
Legal Department, M/S 35
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING			
I hereby certify that this correspondence, including the enclosures identified herein, is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date shown below. If the Express Mail Mailing Number is filled in below, then this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.10.			
Signature:			
Typed or Printed Name:	Arnold M. de Guzman, Reg. No. 39,955	Dated:	July 7, 2005
Express Mail Mailing Number (optional):			